

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/816,524

Applicant(s)

CARR ET AL.

Examiner

Wendy Boss

Art Unit

1775

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Wendy Boss.

(3) Adam Masia.

(2) Bob Connors.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 11 March 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Identification of prior art discussed: Reid, Friedrich.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' counsel argues that the Reid reference teaches only lines on a natural grass runway in one color, rather than characters showing specific markings; and that in the reference the markings are on the grass runway itself, rather than adjacent to a concrete or asphalt runway. Counsel further points out that none of the cited references discloses a turf that is attached to a support that is embedded into a concrete or asphalt runway. Counsel proposes amending the claims or adding new claims with limitations where the markings form an extension of a symbol on a paved runway (as depicted at reference numeral 234 in Figure 18); and where markings replicate a symbol that is on a paved runway (as depicted in Figure 19). Also, propose possibly adding claims reciting an advertisement (as depicted at reference numeral 232 in Figure 18) in combination with a support embedded in a concrete or asphalt runway. Will be further considered upon formal submission.